

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are now pending in the application. Claims 1, 3, 6 and 10 have been amended and claims 14 and 15 are added as new. Support for the foregoing amendments can be found throughout the specification, drawings, and claims as originally filed. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 2, and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Byers et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,693,901).

Claims 3 and 4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Byers et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,693,901) in view of Smith (U.S. Pat. No. 6,792,515).

Claims 6-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Byers et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,693,901) in view of Smith (U.S. Pat. No. 6,792,515) and further in view of Gleeson et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,763,023).

These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Byers et al. at best appears to show fabric based systems using a central high-speed fabric for switching traffic between modules. High-speed point-to-point connections are routed over a backplane and a central fabric in a star topology. Byers et al. appears to show switching traffic using a control/routing circuit which is necessary for implementing the protocol to control the routing (see Byers et al.: column 3, lines 15-30). In other words, Byers et al. shows switching traffic with a router at Layer 3.

In contrast, claim 1 recites that “the centralized exchanging and controlling unit utilizes a HUB structure or a SWITCH structure to perform its functionalities.” In other words, claim 1 switches a message at Layer 1 or Layer 2. One of ordinary skill in the art would appreciate that a router uses a network address for communication and needs to be set up before the communication. On the other hand, a switch or hub uses a hardware address for communication without the need for setting up the address before the communication. Consequently, the speed of processing messages by a switch or hub is faster than the speed of processing packets by a router.

Further, claim 6 recites “before communicating between the modules, presetting a state of address pins of each of the modules, each of the modules getting its own address by reading the current state of its own address pins.”

The Examiner has acknowledged that Byers et al. fails to teach this limitation but asserts that one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to modify Byers et al. based on the teaching of Smith. Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner’s assertion.

Smith at least appears to show that one or more bus controllers of server blades may be configured to read geographic address information that uniquely identifies each system or blade. Smith may use this identification information to define the window in the blade’s system memory that is visible to other processors so that the other processors can access the window in the blade’s system memory (see Smith: lines 25-29 in column 4). In other words, the geographic address information is dedicated to PCI bus addressing in the multiple-processor combination, and the geographic address has to be used in conjunction with the other addresses, such as starting addresses, in order

to differentiate among the memory windows of various server blades (see Smith: lines 50-56 in column 3, lines 33-36 in column 4, lines 3-25, in column 5). Furthermore, one skill in the art would appreciate that in the Compact PCI specification, the set of server blades have to include a system blade that is responsible for managing the configuration of the remaining blades (see Smith: lines 13-15 in column 6). Thus, Applicant submits that Smith fails to teach the above limitations.

Claim 6 further recites that “when communicating between the modules, sending a message carrying a destination address to the centralized exchanging and controlling unit by a source module, processing the message by the centralized exchanging and controlling unit, and forwarding the processed message to a destination module by the centralized exchanging and controlling unit according to the destination address, wherein the destination address is an address of the destination module obtained by reading the current state of the address pins of the destination module.”

Applicant submits that Smith fails to teach the limitation that “the destination address is an address of the destination module obtained by reading the current state of the address pins of the destination module.”

The Examiner has acknowledged that Byers and Smith fails to teach the above limitation, but asserts that Gleeson teaches the above limitation. Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner’s assertion.

Gleeson at best appears to show that an MAC address as the destination address. Further, switching packets using the MAC addresses of different network device in a network differs from switching messages based on the state of address pins of different modules in a device.

Further, Byers et al. appears to show a fabric based systems in a star topology, Smith relates to an addressing technology dedicated to the Compact PCI specification, and Gleeson relates to communications between system devices in a network. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be able to combine Byers et al., Smith and Gleeson to arrive at claim 6.

Applicant further submits that claim 10 recites one or more features similar to one or more of the distinguishing features of claim 6.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-5, claim 6 and its dependent claims 7-9 and 14-15 as well as claim 10 and its dependent claims 11-13 define over the art cited by the Examiner.

NEW CLAIMS

Claims 14 and 15 have been added as new. Applicant believes claims 14-15 define over the art cited by the Examiner.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner

believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 4, 2008

By: /Joseph M. Lafata/
Joseph M. Lafata, Reg. No. 37,166

HARNES, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

JML/PFD/evm